

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-18 were canceled. Claims 7 and 13 are currently pending in the present application, none of which has been amended.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ohran* (US 5,835,953). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 7 (and similarly Claim 13) recites a step of "designating only one node within a shared storage system an owner node for metadata relating to all input/output (I/O) relationships of a region of storage" and a step of "designating remaining nodes within said shared storage system client nodes."

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed designating steps are disclosed by Figure 1 of *Ohran* with primary system **12** being characterized as the claimed owner node and backup system **14** being characterized as the claimed client node. Assuming *arguendo* that primary system **12** in Figure 1 of *Ohran* can be characterized as the claimed owner node, and since the Examiner had chosen to characterize backup system **14** as the claimed client node, there still remains one node (*i.e.*, the other primary system **12**) left in Figure 1 that was not designated by the Examiner. Since the claimed designating step requires all remaining nodes to be designated as client nodes, such designation will conflict with the Examiner's characterization of primary system **12** since primary system **12** cannot be both the claimed owner node and the claimed client node.

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "*Ohran*'s system does not necessitate more than one primary system; therefore, *Ohran*'s system with one primary system reads upon applicant's claimed limitation." It seems the Examiner has overlooked the point that Figure 1 of *Ohran* shows two primary systems **12**, which means *Ohran*'s system is not a single primary system as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner cannot conveniently ignore one of the two primary systems in Figure 1 of *Ohran*.

In addition, Claim 1 recites multiple client nodes in the step of "designating remaining nodes within said shared storage system client nodes" (emphasis added). Since the Examiner characterizes only backup system **14** as the claimed client node, it does not read on the claimed designating step that specifically recites more than one client node.

Basically, *Ohran* discloses an computing environment having two primary systems **12** and one backup system **14**. The first claimed designating step recites only one owner node, which is different from *Ohran*'s two primary systems **12**. The second claimed designating step recites multiple client nodes, which is different from *Ohran*'s one backup system **14**. Such distinction is not simply semantics because if there is only one client node, as disclosed in *Ohran*, then lock management for one client node, as claimed or as dictated by common sense, would just be a waste of resources.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not disclosed by *Ohran*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 7 and 13 are currently pending in the present application. Applicants believe that Claims 7 and 13 are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0449**.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
*Registration No. 43,427*  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS